

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHARLENE STITH,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 1:23-cv-00947 JLT GSA (PC)

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF'S  
COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY  
PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT  
HAVE NOT BEEN FILED

COUNSEL'S RESPONSE, OR IN THE  
ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S)  
OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS

VICTORIA GREEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 1:23-cv-00973 JLT GSA (PC)

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF'S  
COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY  
PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT  
HAVE NOT BEEN FILED

COUNSEL'S RESPONSE, OR IN THE  
ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S)  
OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS

TREMAINE CARROLL,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

No. 1:23-cv-00974 JLT GSA (PC)

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF'S  
COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY  
PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT  
HAVE NOT BEEN FILED

COUNSEL'S RESPONSE, OR IN THE  
ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S)

1	Defendants.	OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS
2		
3	JONATHAN ROBERTSON, Plaintiff, v. STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al., Defendants.	No. 1:23-cv-00975 JLT GSA (PC) ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT HAVE NOT BEEN FILED COUNSEL'S RESPONSE, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S) OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	FANCY MOORE LIPSEY, Plaintiff, v. STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al., Defendants.	No. 1:23-cv-00976 JLT GSA (PC) ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT HAVE NOT BEEN FILED COUNSEL'S RESPONSE, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S) OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15	RAYSHAWN HART, Plaintiff, v. STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al., Defendants.	No. 1:23-cv-00977 JLT GSA (PC) ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT HAVE NOT BEEN FILED COUNSEL'S RESPONSE, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S) OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22	CRYSTAL GRAHAM Plaintiff, v. STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al., Defendants.	No. 1:23-cv-01323 JLT GSA (PC) ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT HAVE NOT BEEN FILED COUNSEL'S RESPONSE, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S) OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 ROXANNE PURDAGONE,  
2 Plaintiff,  
3 v.  
4 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,  
5 Defendants.

No. 1:23-cv-01324 JLT GSA (PC)  
**ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF'S  
COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY  
PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT  
HAVE NOT BEEN FILED**  
**COUNSEL'S RESPONSE, OR IN THE  
ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S)  
OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS**

7 ZENAIDA CORDOVA  
8 Plaintiff,  
9 v.  
10 GREG RODRIGUEZ, et al.,  
11 Defendants.

No. 1:24-cv-00482 JLT GSA (PC)  
**ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF'S  
COUNSEL TO INFORM COURT WHY  
PROOF(S) OF SERVICE OF COMPLAINT  
HAVE NOT BEEN FILED**  
**COUNSEL'S RESPONSE, OR IN THE  
ALTERNATIVE, THE FILING OF PROOF(S)  
OF SERVICE, DUE IN SEVEN DAYS**

13 On October 29, 2024, in Carroll v. State of California, No. 1:23-cv-00974 JLT GSA, the  
14 Court ordered Deputy Attorney General (“DAG”) Arthur B. Mark, III – who represents named  
15 defendants in the other matters that have been related – to inform the Court whether the Office of  
16 the Attorney General (“OAG”) was representing any defendants in the Carroll case, and if so, to  
17 file a notice of appearance. See Carroll, ECF No. 26. DAG Mark was given seven days to file a  
18 response to the Court’s order.

19 On November 4, 2024, DAG Mark made a special appearance on behalf of Respondent  
20 OAG, and filed a response to the Court’s order. Based on the contents of that response, the Court  
21 reviewed the docket in Carroll and the dockets in the related matters identified above and notes  
22 that no proofs of service indicating that the operative complaint in each matter was served on the  
23 appropriate defendant(s) have been filed with the Court. Therefore, counsel for Plaintiffs,  
24 Attorney Joseph A. Virgilio, will be ordered to inform the Court why he has not filed the  
25 appropriate proofs of service with the Court. As an alternative to informing the Court why the  
26 proofs of service have not been filed, Attorney Virgilio may file them in each of the above-  
27 referenced cases. Counsel will be given seven days to take either course of action.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Counsel for Plaintiffs, Attorney Joseph A. Virgilio, shall INFORM the Court why he has not filed proofs of service of the operative complaints in each of the above-referenced matters;

2. As an alternative to informing the Court why the proofs of service have not been filed, Attorney Virgilio may FILE the proofs of service of the operative complaints in each of the above-referenced matters, and
  3. Attorney Virgilio will be given seven days from the date of this order to take either course of action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **November 9, 2024**

/s/ Gary S. Austin  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE